REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated August 12, 2004, where the Examiner has rejected claims 1-23. By the present amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 15, 20 and 21 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-23 in view of the amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

A. Rejection of claims under 35 USC §102

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-17, 19-21, and 23 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nordwall (US Pat. No. 6,097,943).

To facilitate a more efficient discussion of the Examiner's rejections, the applicant will first address independent claim 10. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 10, and submits that not all the limitations of original claim 10 are found in Nordwall. For example, claim 10 recites a method of storing data that comprises:

> "storing data version ID in the memory, the data version ID configured to
>
> be read by a communication device and provide identification information
>
> regarding the data"

In finding this limitation in Nordwall, the Examiner makes the following statement :

> d) storing data version ID in the memory, the data version ID configured to
>
> be read by a communication device and provide identification information
>
> regarding the data (fig. 1-4, col. lines 18-35).

The cite for the statement does not give a column number, but the applicant believes the Examiner was citing to lines 18-35 of column 4. The cited passage discloses that the Nordwall device has a memory for storing calculated parameter values (col. 4, lns. 20-22), and further indicates that these calculated values are unique to the environment in which the accessory is operated (col. 4, lns. 22-25). The cited passage also discloses that the Nordwall device has a microcontroller which is capable of data exchange, and has the capability of identifying to the mobile telephone that the accessory includes memory capabilities (col. 4, lns. 30-35).

However, nowhere in the cited passage, or in Figs. 1-4, does Nordwall disclose a version ID or storing a version ID in memory. Instead, the values stored in the Nordwall accessory are values that have been calculated by the mobile subscriber unit which are set according to the environment in which the accessory is used. *See*, col. 2, ln. 61 to col. 3. ln. 12. Since the Nordwall values are calculated according to a current environment or condition, the values can not be considered to be a version identification. These calculated values are not used for identification purposes, but by storing these calculated values in the accessory, the processor in the mobile unit does not have to recalculate these parameters on subsequent connections to the accessory. *See*, col. 6, lns. 20-24.

In contrast to the calculated/stored parameters of Nordwall, claim 10 recites the storing of a "data version ID". The data version ID is configured to be read by a communication device and provide identification information regarding the data. By way of example, the data version ID may be uniquely associated with a version of the control data. *See*, paragraph 45, lns. 6-11 of the specification. This version ID may be used to quickly an efficiently compare versions or contents of the control data. *Id*. As further

described in the specification, this enables a communication device to compare the version ID of the control data in the accessory to the version ID of the control data stored in the communication device. *See*, paragraph 45, lns. 3-5 of the specification. Responsive to this comparison, the communication device may selectively recall control data from the accessory memory. *See*, paragraph 46 of the Specification.

Since Nordwall does not disclose every limitation of claim 10, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Nordwall.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the system includes "a non-volatile memory storing an accessory version ID." For similar reasons as discussed with reference to claim 10, the applicant submits that Nordwall fails to disclose all the limitations of amended claim 1. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Nordwall.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to clarify that the method includes "version identification data", and has amended claim 9 for proper antecedent support. For similar reasons as discussed with reference to claim 10, the applicant submits that Nordwall fails to disclose all the limitations of amended claim 5. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Nordwall.

Applicant has amended claim 15 to clarify that the communication device includes "a non-volatile memory storing an accessory version ID." For similar reasons as discussed with reference to claim 10, the applicant submits that Nordwall fails to disclose all the limitations of amended claim 15. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Nordwall.

Applicant has amended claim 20 to clarify that the system includes a "control data version identifier." For similar reasons as discussed with reference to claim 10, the applicant submits that Nordwall fails to disclose all the limitations of amended claim 20. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Nordwall.

Applicant has amended claim 21 to clarify that the system has "an accessory non-volatile memory configured to store a version ID." Further, the system has a processor that is "configured to selectively receive the control data over the bus responsive to comparing the version ID to identification data stored in the communication device." For similar reasons as discussed with reference to claim 10, the applicant submits that Nordwall fails to disclose all the limitations of amended claim 21. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Nordwall.

B. Rejection of claims under 35 USS §103

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the office action, the Examiner rejects claims 6, 11, 13, 18, and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordwall (US Pat. No. 6,097,943). As discussed with reference to the 102(b) rejection above, each of these claims has at least one limitation not found in Nordwall. Since Nordwall does not teach or disclose every elements of these claims, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 11, 13, 18, and 22 can not be rendered obvious by Nordwall.

C. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, an early allowance of claims 1-23 pending in the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _Nov 8, 2004_

By: _____
Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 42,200

Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.
Kyocera Wireless Corp.
Attn: Patent Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Tel: (858) 882-3501
Fax: (858) 882-2485